

Application No. 10/025,316
Amendment dated 24 January 2006
Reply to Office Action dated 21 October 2005

Attorney Docket No. COR-001-US

Remarks

Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the instant application in view of the following remarks.

Priority Date

The Examiner has stated that "[t]his application claimed the priority of 12/19/200". Applicant respectfully submits that this application claims a priority of 12/18/200, as stated on page 1 at line 4 of the application, and as evidenced by the Declaration and the Official Filing Receipt for U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/256,781, copies of which are provided in the Appendix. The instant application claims the benefit of U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/256,781 filed on December 18, 2000.

Claim Status

Claims 1-43 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,801,946 to Child et al.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,801,946 to Child et al. Applicant respectfully traverses, and respectfully submits that Child et al. is not a proper reference under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) because it fails to disclose the elements and limitations of any claims of the instant invention. As best understood, Child et al. provides for enabling a user in an enterprise computing environment to access several different systems, each having unique and separate user identifiers and passwords, without requiring an associated GSO "database" within the associated distributed computing environment. This is substantially different from what is disclosed and claimed by the instant application, which provides for a second client (second user) to communicate with a first client associated with a portable memory element, wherein the portable memory element contains data that is accessible by a first user who provides a passcode associated with the portable memory element, wherein the communication between the first and second clients is enabled by a passkey generated responsive to the passcode and provided to the second client by the first user.

Application No. 10/025,316
Amendment dated 24 January 2006
Reply to Office Action dated 21 October 2005

Attorney Docket No. COR-001-US

Regarding claims 1, 20, 23, 33 and 40, Applicant respectfully submits that Child et al. neither discloses nor suggests all of the elements and limitations of claims 1, 20, 23, 33 and 40, and therefore is not a proper reference under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has not properly interpreted Child et al. in view of the instant application, but instead, has used impermissible hindsight reasoning to reject claims 1, 20, 23, 33 and 40. Applicant respectfully submits that, as best understood, Child et al. does not disclose or suggest the following elements of claims 1, 20, 23, 33 and 40:

Portable memory element containing data of a person (claims 1, 20, 23, 33 and 40):

Applicant respectfully submits that Child et al. does not disclose or suggest a portable memory element containing data of a person. As best understood, the removable memory described on col. 3 at lines 25-30 of Child et al. -- referred to by the Examiner -- is used for storing a set of instructions stored as a computer program, not data of a person.

Passcode necessary to access data from portable memory element (claims 1, 20, 23,

33 and 40): Applicant respectfully submits that Child et al. does not disclose or suggest a passcode associated with the portable memory element. As best understood, the userID and user password referred to on col. 5 at lines 32-52 of Child et al. -- referred to by the Examiner -- provide for the user to sign-on to the data processing services, and are not necessary to access the portable memory element referred to by the Examiner, which can contain the program that controls access to the one or more data processing services.

First passkey from server to client (claims 1, 20, 23, 33 and 40): Applicant respectfully submits that Child et al. does not disclose or suggest a first passkey that is provided by the server to the first client. As best understood, the first userID and user password referred to on col. 26 at lines 1-64 of Child et al. -- referred to by the Examiner -- would, in the context of the instant application, correspond to a passcode rather than the passkey. Accordingly, Child et al. does not disclose or suggest a passkey that is provided if the passcode information is authentic for the given portable memory element.

Application No. 10/025,316
Amendment dated 24 January 2006
Reply to Office Action dated 21 October 2005

Attorney Docket No. COR-001-US

Communication with a second client (claims 1, 20, 23, 33 and 40): Applicant respectfully submits that Child et al. does not disclose or suggest a communication with a second client. As best understood, the second user referred to on col. 26 at lines 1-64 of Child et al. -- referred to by the Examiner -- is actually a second user identification, not a second user. Child et al. does not appear to disclose or suggest any more than one user, although that user can be associated first and second user identifications.

Second passkey from second client to server (claims 1 and 20): Applicant respectfully submits that Child et al. does not disclose or suggest providing for a server to receive a second passkey or second signal from a second client. As best understood, the second user ID and password referred to on col. 26 at lines 1-64 of Child et al. -- referred to by the Examiner -- is actually a second user identification and password by which the first user can become authenticated, not that of a second user. Child et al. does not appear to disclose or suggest any more than one user, although that user can be associated first and second user identifications.

Communication of information with second client (claims 1, 20, 23, 33, 40): Applicant respectfully submits that Child et al. does not disclose or suggest providing for a first client to communicate with a second client. As best understood, the "first matches to second" referred to on col. 26 at lines 1-64 of Child et al. -- referred to by the Examiner -- is actually the matching of a first and second user identifications and passwords associated with a common user, not a comparison of passkeys associated with different first and second users, the first user having provided the passkey to the second user. Child et al. does not appear to disclose or suggest any more than one user, although that user can be associated first and second user identifications, and does not appear to disclose or suggest communication between that one user and any other user.

Application No. 10/025,316
Amendment dated 24 January 2006
Reply to Office Action dated 21 October 2005

Attorney Docket No. COR-001-US

Applicant respectfully submits that the Child et al. neither discloses nor suggests the elements and limitations of claims 1, 20, 23, 33 and 40. Because of this, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 20, 23, 33 and 40 are distinguished from Child et al., and that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) of claims 1, 20, 23, 33 and 40 are not justified. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 20, 23, 33 and 40 in view of the above argument.

Claims 2-19 each depend upon claim 1; claims 21 and 22 each depend upon claim 20; claims 24-32 each depend upon claim 23; claims 34-39 each depend upon claim 33; and claims 41-43 each depend upon claim 40. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that if the above argument regarding the novelty of claims 1, 20, 23, 33 and 40 in view of Child et al. is accepted, then claims 2-13, 21, 22, 24-32, 34-39 and 41-43 are also distinguished from Child et al. because the addition of further limitations to an already novel claim does not negate novelty. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 2-13, 21, 22, 24-32, 34-39 and 41-43 in view of the above argument in respect of claims 1, 20, 23, 33 and 40.

Furthermore, regarding claims 2 and 25, Applicant respectfully submits that Child et al. does not disclose or suggest a method of providing for communications between a client and a server comprising providing for encrypting the transmitted signals and decrypting the received signals, wherein the client is adapted to communicate with the portable memory element. As best understood, the "first matches to second" referred to on col. 26 at lines 1-64 of Child et al. -- referred to by the Examiner -- makes no reference to any encryption process, nor any reference to encryption of communications between a client and a server.

Furthermore, regarding claims 4 and 27, as best understood, the "senior admin" referred to on col. 17 at lines 25-35 of Child et al. -- referred to by the Examiner -- does not disclose or suggest medical information of a person who is capable of providing the passcode information necessary to access data from the portable memory element medical. Indeed, the word "medical" does not appear to be used anywhere by Child et al.

Application No. 10/025,316
Amendment dated 24 January 2006
Reply to Office Action dated 21 October 2005

Attorney Docket No. COR-001-US

Furthermore, regarding claims 5 and 28, as best understood, the reference to "fingerprint" on col. 21 at lines 35-45 of Child et al. -- referred to by the Examiner -- does not disclose or suggest an association with an associated portable memory element, as provided for by claims 5 and 28.

Furthermore, regarding claims 6 and 29, as best understood, the reference to "biological" on col. 3 at line 37 of Child et al. -- referred to by the Examiner -- refers to the storage of program information in memory, not to alphanumeric information or biometric information provided by a person associated with the portable memory element.

Furthermore, regarding claims 8, 21 and 30, as best understood, the reference to "removable memory" on col. 3 at lines 25-30 of Child et al. -- referred to by the Examiner -- refers to removable memory for program storage, and does not disclose or suggest providing for enabling the first client either to read information from, or to record information to, the portable memory device if the passcode information is authentic for the portable memory element.

Furthermore, regarding claims 10 and 32, as best understood, the reference to "senior admin" on col. 17 at lines 25-35 of Child et al. -- referred to by the Examiner -- does not disclose or suggest the identification of a level of authority of a client, or controlling access to the data responsive to the level of authority.

Furthermore, regarding claims 11 and 24, as best understood, the reference to "first and second user" on col. 26 at lines 1-64 of Child et al. -- referred to by the Examiner -- refers to first and second user identifications and passwords associated with a common user, rather than first and second separate users; and further does not disclose providing for a first user associated with the first client to provide the first passkey to at least one second user associated with at least one second client.

Furthermore, regarding claim 12, as best understood, the reference to "encryption key" on col. 9 at lines 23-43 of Child et al. -- referred to by the Examiner -- refers to an encryption process for dynamically generating of passwords, and does not disclose or suggest providing for encrypting signals sent to the second client and decrypting those signals received by the second client. Indeed, as noted hereinabove, Child et al. does not disclose or suggest another user in communication with the disclosed user.

Application No. 10/025,316
Amendment dated 24 January 2006
Reply to Office Action dated 21 October 2005

Attorney Docket No. COR-001-US

Furthermore, regarding claims 13 and 22, Applicant respectfully submits that Child et al. does not disclose or suggest the operation of providing for enabling at least one second client either to read information from, or to record information to, the portable memory device if a second passkey corresponds to a first passkey. As best understood, the reference to "first matches to second" on col. 26 at lines 1-64 of Child et al. -- referred to by the Examiner -- discloses only one user who is not in communication with any other user responsive to whether a second passkey corresponds to a first passkey.

Furthermore, regarding claims 14 and 15, as best understood, the reference to "Internet" on col. 3 at line 32 of Child et al. -- referred to by the Examiner -- does not disclose or suggest a CORBAMED system, let alone a CORBAMED system comprising a Terminology Query Service server, a Clinical Observation Access Service server, and a Resource Access Decision server.

Furthermore, regarding claims 16-18, as best understood, the reference to "several attributes" on col. 5 at lines 32-39 of Child et al. -- referred to by the Examiner -- does not disclose or suggest either a CORBAMED system, a method of providing for the first client to read at least one trait from the portable memory element and providing for receiving the at least one trait from the first client (claim 16); a method of communicating the at least one trait to the CORBAMED system and communicating data from the CORBAMED system corresponding to the at least one trait to at least one of the first client and the at least one second client (claim 17); and at least one trait defined in accordance with a Health Level 7 (HL7) specification (claim 18).

Furthermore, regarding claims 19, as best understood, the reference to "database" on col. 1 at line 32-40 of Child et al. -- referred to by the Examiner -- does not disclose or suggest either a CORBAMED system, or the process of storing information from either the first client or the at least one second client in at least one database operatively associated with the CORBAMED system

Application No. 10/025,316
Amendment dated 24 January 2006
Reply to Office Action dated 21 October 2005

Attorney Docket No. COR-001-US

Applicant respectfully submits that the Child et al. neither discloses nor suggests the elements and limitations of claims 2, 4-6, 8, 10-19, 21, 22, 24-25, 27-30 and 32. Because of this, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2, 4-6, 8, 10-19, 21, 22, 24-25, 27-30 and 32 are distinguished from Child et al., and that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) of claims 2, 4-6, 8, 10-19, 21, 22, 24-25, 27-30 and 32 are not justified. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 2, 4-6, 8, 10-19, 21, 22, 24-25, 27-30 and 32 in view of the above argument.

Extension of Time and Payment of Fees Under 37 CFR § 1.17(a)(3)
Authorization to Charge Fee Deficiencies

Applicant hereby petitions for a One-Month Extension of Time, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, extending the deadline for response up to and including 21 February 2006, resulting in an associated fee of \$60 under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a)(1). A Credit Card Payment Form in the amount of \$60 is enclosed herewith for payment of the fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a)(1). The Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayments -- that cannot otherwise be made to the credit card -- to Deposit Account 04-1131.

Summary and Conclusions

The claim rejections have been traversed. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added by this amendment. Applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is now in the proper form for Notice of Allowance, and respectfully requests a timely issuance thereof in this application.

Respectfully Submitted,



Kurt L. VanVoorhies, Ph.D., P.E.

Registration No. 38,643

Phone: 248-364-2100

Facsimile: 248-364-2200

Raggio & Dinnin, P.C.
2701 Cambridge Court, Suite 410
Auburn Hills, MI 48326
COR-001-US (1221-00001)
24 January 2006

Practitioner's Docket No.: COR-001-US

PATENT

COMBINED DECLARATION AND POWER OF ATTORNEY

As a below named inventor, I hereby declare that:

TYPE OF DECLARATION

This declaration is for an original patent application.

INVENTORSHIP IDENTIFICATION

My residence, post office address and citizenship are as stated below next to my name. I believe that I am the original, first and sole inventor (if only one name is listed below) or an original, first and joint inventor (if plural names are listed below) of the subject matter which is claimed and for which a patent is sought on the invention entitled:

TITLE OF INVENTION**COMPUTER ORIENTED RECORD ADMINISTRATION SYSTEM****SPECIFICATION IDENTIFICATION**

the specification of which is attached hereto.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF REVIEW OF PAPERS AND DUTY OF CANDOR

I hereby state that I have reviewed and understand the contents of the above-identified specification, including the claims, as amended by any amendment referred to above.

I acknowledge the duty to disclose information which is material to patentability as defined in Title 37, Code of Federal Regulations, §1.56.

PRIORITY CLAIM

I hereby claim the benefit under Title 35, United States Code, § 119(c) of United States Provisional Application No. 06/256,781 filed on December 18, 2000 (12/18/2000).

POWER OF ATTORNEY

I hereby appoint Kurt L. VanVoorhies, registration number 38,643, to prosecute this application and transact all business in the Patent and Trademark Office connected therewith.

Direct all telephone calls to Kurt L. VanVoorhies at telephone number 906-297-8011.Send all correspondence to Kurt L. VanVoorhiesP.O. Box 68, DeTour Village, MI 49725**DECLARATION**

I hereby declare that all statements made herein of my own knowledge are true and that all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true; and further that these statements were made with the knowledge that willful false statements and the like so made are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, under Section 1001 of Title 18 of the United States Code and that such willful false statements may jeopardize the validity of the application of any patent issued thereon.

SIGNATUREFull name of sole or first inventor (given name, family name) Cora AliuagInventor's signature Cora Aliuag Date 12/09/01

Residence and Post Office Address
4545 28th St. NW
Washington, D.C. 20008

Citizenship United States of America

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

BEST AVAILABLE COPY



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	GRP ART UNIT	FIL FEE REC'D	ATTY DOCKET NO	DRAWINGS	TOT CLAIMS	IND CLAIMS
60/256,781	12/18/2000		75	COR-001- PRO	3		

Kurt L. VanVoorhies
20031 E. M-134
P.O. Box 68
De Tour Village, MI 49725CONFIRMATION NO. 5285
CORRECTED FILING RECEIPT

OC000000006304867

Date Mailed: 06/18/2002

Receipt is acknowledged of this provisional Patent Application. It will not be examined for patentability and will become abandoned not later than twelve months after its filing date. Be sure to provide the U.S. APPLICATION NUMBER, FILING DATE, NAME OF APPLICANT, and TITLE OF INVENTION when inquiring about this application. Fees transmitted by check or draft are subject to collection. Please verify the accuracy of the data presented on this receipt. If an error is noted on this Filing Receipt, please write to the Office of Initial Patent Examination's Filing Receipt Corrections, facsimile number 703-748-9195. Please provide a copy of this Filing Receipt with the changes noted thereon. If you received a "Notice to File Missing Parts" for this application, please submit any corrections to this Filing Receipt with your reply to the Notice. When the USPTO processes the reply to the Notice, the USPTO will generate another Filing Receipt incorporating the requested corrections (if appropriate).

Applicant(s)

Cora Alisuag, Washington, DC;

If Required, Foreign Filing License Granted 06/18/2002

Projected Publication Date: Complete

Non-Publication Request: No

Early Publication Request: No

** SMALL ENTITY **

Title

Computer oriented record administration system

LICENSE FOR FOREIGN FILING UNDER
Title 35, United States Code, Section 184
Title 37, Code of Federal Regulations, 5.11 & 5.15

GRANTED